

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 04 2010

Attorney Docket No.: P-US-TN-3305
Application Serial No.: 10/688,668

REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 3, 2010, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

By this Amendment, claim 2 has been canceled and claims 1, 66, and 67 have been amended. No new matter is presented. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 66 and 67 can be found in at least paragraphs [0057]-[0059] and [0067] of the application as originally filed. Claims 1, 3, 5, 66-69, 71, 80, 81 and 83-85 are pending and respectfully submitted for consideration.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 and 85

Claims 1-3 and 85 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 5,676,124, "Lee '124") in view of Greenland (U.S. Patent No. 6,276,990, "Greenland '990") further in view of Tsao (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,866) and Smith et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,347,624, "Smith") and Belfiglio (U.S. Patent No. 6,412,380). As noted above, claim 2 has been canceled. Claims 3 and 85 depend from claim 1.

The Applicant traverses the rejection and respectfully submits that claims 1, 3 and 85 recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "a table slidingly disposed on the first rail through at least one set of wheels mounted to an underside thereof, the table being movable in a direction substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis...wherein the first rail has a first end, and the table and the at least one set of wheels are movable beyond the first end." The Office Action asserted that Lee '124 discloses "wherein the first rail (34) as a first end, and the table (28) is movable beyond the first end (table over hangs the rollers)." See page 5 of the Office Action. However, Lee '124 does not disclose or suggest a table and the at least one set of wheels that are moveable beyond the first end of a rail. In Lee '124, the roller 56 stops at the end of the rolling bar 34. See Figure 1 of Lee '124. Greenland '990, Tsao, Smith and Belfiglio fail to cure this deficiency in Lee '124 as the references also do not disclose or suggest at least the feature of a table and at least one set of wheels movable beyond the first end of a rail. Therefore, the combination of Lee

Attorney Docket No.: P-US-TN-3305
Application Serial No.: 10/688,668

'124, Greenland, Tsao, Smith and Belfiglio does not disclose or suggest the features of the invention as recited in claim 1, and thereby, dependent claims 3 and 85.

In view of the above, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, and 85.

Claim 5

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee '124 in view of Greenland '990, Tsao, Smith, Belfiglio and in view of Fuhrman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,637,424, "Fuhrman"). The Applicant traverses the rejection and respectfully submits that claim 5 recites subject matter that is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1. Fuhrman fails to cure the deficiencies in Lee '124, Greenland '990, Tsao, Smith and Belfiglio with respect to claim 1, as Fuhrman also does not disclose or suggest "a table slidingly disposed on the first rail through at least one set of wheels mounted to an underside thereof, the table being movable in a direction substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis...wherein the first rail has a first end, and the table and the at least one set of wheels are movable beyond the first end." In contrast, Fuhrman discloses "end rail end tabs 256 and 258 prevent the wheels 162 from traveling past the ends of the rails 54 and 56." See column 9, lines 2-4 of Fuhrman. As such, the combination of Lee '124, Greenland '990, Tsao, Smith, Belfiglio and Fuhrman fails to disclose or suggest the features of the invention as recited in claim 1, and therefore, dependent claim 5.

In view of the above, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5.

Claims 66-68, and 82-84

Claims 66-68 and 82-84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsao in view of Greenland '990 and further in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,272,961, "Lee '961"), Jameson (U.S. Patent No. 3,777,792), Weissman (U.S. Patent No. 4,885,956), Mayfield (U.S. Patent No. 5,063,806), Rueb (U.S. Patent No. 5,577,428), Welch (U.S. Patent No. 5,906,528), Greenland (U.S. Patent No. 6,080,041, "Greenland '041"), and Gorgol et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,273,081).

Attorney Docket No.: P-US-TN-3305
Application Serial No.: 10/688,668

As a preliminary matter, as stated in the previous Responses to Office Actions, claim 82 has been canceled.

Claims 68 and 84 depend from claim 67 and claim 83 depends from claim 66. The Applicant traverses the rejection and respectfully submits that claims 66-68, 83, and 84 recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references.

Claims 66 and 67, as amended, recite, in part, "a table slidingly disposed on the first rail through at least one set of wheels mounted to an underside thereof, the table being movable in a direction substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis...wherein the first rail has a first end, and the table and the at least one set of wheels are movable beyond the first end." Tsao and Greenland '990 do not disclose or suggest these features. Further, none of Lee '961, Jameson, Weissman, Mayfield, Rueb Welch, Greenland '041 or Gorgol cures the deficiencies in Tsao and Greenland '990. As such, the combination of cited references do not disclose or suggest the features of the invention as recited in claims 66 and 67, and therefore, dependent claims 68, 83 and 84.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 66 and 67 and dependent claims 68, 81, 83, and 84 are allowable.

Claims 69, 71 and 81

Claim 69 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsao in view of Greenland '990, Lee '961, Jameson, Weissman, Mayfield, Rueb, Welch, Greenland '041, and Gorgol and further in view of McCambridge et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,350,193), Marcoux et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,342,226), Brenta (U.S. Patent No. 4,105,055), Sanfilippo (U.S. Patent No. 6,745,803) and Otto (U.S. Patent No. 5,161,590).

Claim 71 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee '124 in view of Greenland '990 and further in view of Tsao, Smith and Belfiglio and further in view of Sigitich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,428,159).

Claim 80 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee '124 in view of Greenland '990 and further in view of Tsao, Smith and Belfiglio and further in view of Jameson, Weissman, Mayfield, Rueb, Welch, and Gorgol.

Attorney Docket No.: P-US-TN-3305
Application Serial No.: 10/688,668

Claim 81 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsao in view of Greenland '990, Lee '961, Jameson, Weissman, Mayfield, Rueb, Welch, Greenland '041, and Gorgol and further in view of Sigelich.

The Applicant traverses the rejections and respectfully submits that claims 69, 71, 80, and 81 recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references. Claim 69 depends from claim 67, claims 71 and 80 depend from claim 1, and claim 81 depends from claim 66.

As discussed above, the combination of Lee '124, Greenland '990, Tsao, Smith and Belfiglio fails to teach or suggest the features of the invention as recited in claim 1. Jameson, Weissman, Mayfield, Rueb, Welch, Gorgol and Sigelich fail cure the deficiencies in Lee '124, Greenland '990 Tsao, Smith and Belfiglio as these references also do not disclose or suggest "a table slidingly disposed on the first rail through at least one set of wheels mounted to an underside thereof, the table being movable in a direction substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis...wherein the first rail has a first end, and the table and the at least one set of wheels are movable beyond the first end". Therefore, the cited references do not disclose or suggest the features of the invention as recited in dependent claims 71 and 80.

Also discussed above, the combination of Tsao and Greenland '990 in combination with Lee '961, Jameson, Weissman, Mayfield, Rueb, Welch, Greenland '041, and Gorgol fails to teach or suggest the features of the invention as recited in claims 66 and 67. McCambridge, Marcoux, Brenta, Sanfilippo, Otto and Sigelich further fail to cure the deficiencies in the above-cited references as they also do not disclose or suggest at least the features of a table slidingly disposed on the first rail through at least one set of wheels mounted to an underside thereof, the table being movable in a direction substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis...wherein the first rail has a first end, and the table and the at least one set of wheels are movable beyond the first end. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fails to teach or suggest the features of the invention as recited in dependent claims 69 and 81.

In view of the above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fail to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness for purposes of a rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 66-69, 71, 80, 81, 83 and 84 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 5, 66-69, 71, 80, 81, 83 and 84 are not rendered obvious in view of the cited references and should be deemed allowable.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 04 2010

Attorney Docket No.: P-US-TN-3305
Application Serial No.: 10/688,668

Conclusion

The Applicant does not acquiesce to the characterizations of the art. For brevity and to advance prosecution, however, the Applicant has not addressed all characterizations of the art, but reserve the right to do so in further prosecution of this or a subsequent application. Moreover, there may be alternative or additional reasons for patentability not discussed in this response.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's deposit account No. 02-2548, referencing Attorney Dkt. No. P-US-TN-3305.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 4, 2010



Rhonda Barton
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 47,271

The Black & Decker Corporation
701 East Joppa Road, TW199
Towson, MD 21286
Telephone No.: (410) 716-2886
Facsimile No.: (410) 716-2610